

THE GREAT DUTY OF THE HOUR.

SPEECH

OF

HON. P. VAN TRUMP,

DELIVERED AT

THE DEMOCRATIC MASS MEETING

AT

Logan, Hocking County, Ohio, Monday, August 12, 1867.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: Once more you are assembled together to deliberate upon the great questions of government which you and the friends of civil liberty throughout the world too fondly hoped had been settled forever by your wise and patriotic forefathers. The mind of man instinctively looks forward with hope, rather than glance back into the past for lessons of wisdom and experience. We plan for the future more than we reflect upon the past. We would rather be hopeful than wise.— Yet in order to secure and preserve that which is still left to us, we should hold in heedful remembrance all which has already come and gone. The history of the human race for the last three thousand years, shows that public liberty has never been permanently settled. There are ebbes and tides in its historic life, like the ebbes and tides of the sea, forever surging backward and forward, and never finding a fixed and established resting-place either

in the opinions of men or the principles of government. Civil liberty, as written down in our American Constitutions, has been destined to form no exception to this great fact in the history of nations. It has been put upon its trial, and God only knows what is to be the issue. Never, in the most stormy period of American politics, whether before or since the Revolution, or even during our great civil war, did the people assemble together for the consideration of greater or more momentous questions than now. Whatever difference of opinion may exist, however much acrimony of feeling may be exhibited, growing out of this antagonism of opinion, all thinking men are deeply impressed with the fact, and do not hesitate to admit, that in the present crisis are involved the highest interests and the dearest rights that can pertain to man in his social and political relations. I make no false proclamation, I utter but the simple truth,

when I declare to you from this stand, that the great leading and central question involved in this controversy between the Democratic and Radical Republican parties is, *Liberty or Despotism, Union or Disunion!* That is the naked, simple, inevitable issue which you are to pass upon. — The termination of the war has neither changed or modified that issue. Any one who will recollect anything at all of what I said to the people before and during the war, will remember that I looked with more apprehension to the period *after* the war than to the war itself. It was *then* that I felt the strain would be both upon Government and people. It was *then* that I felt that the Union would be most in danger, resulting from the bad passions, the vaulting ambition of desperate leaders, and the general demoralization of the public mind. Have not my worst apprehensions been realized? Can any man look around him upon the wild sea of commotion, and the radical changes made and proposed to be made in the fundamental organism of the Government, and not feel that we are upon the very dead-point of at least a civil revolution which may sweep away every remaining vestige of the Constitution under which we live? I never felt that the war would, in and of itself, settle the question of Union. — That great and vital question, as a Union of States in contradistinction to a mere materialistic unity of territory, is still upon us in all its magnitude as well as its doubtful uncertainty. It is just as much of a question now, and it hangs as tremblingly at the ballot-box, as it hung doubtfully suspended in the smoke of battle over the heads of the shouting, groaning and dying combatants of the hundreds of bloody battle-fields of the late unhappy war. A half million of young and valuable men yielded up their lives for a Union which a desperate and Radical Congress now refuse to recognize; four thousand millions of treasure have been wasted to sustain a Constitution which a selfish and partisan Congress has torn to fragments by usurpation and outrage.

It is true there are other questions, either directly or indirectly involved in the controversy now before us, of vast importance to the people, and which, at any other time, would attract their earnest attention and enlist their deepest solicitude. Such as this most unequal and in-

tolerable burden of taxation, the crushing monopoly of incorporated money capital at the expense of producing labor, dishonest class legislation in the shape of the most exorbitant and villainous tariffs for the benefit of the few against the many, unconstitutional legislation in all its protean forms, usurpation of power, huge and gigantic schemes of speculation and fraud, and the inefable outrage of negro suffrage and negro equality, coupled with the disfranchisement of thousands and hundreds of thousands of white men, without trial, and by classes and denominations, as the wholesale victims of partisan fury, and for no other purposes than those of the merest partisan ends. All these, and more, fellow-citizens, are involved in this contest; but the great, the vital, and the controlling question is, shall our once blessed and glorious Union, standing as a great confraternal family of States, sovereign in every local, but subordinate in all national questions, be restored to its dignity and powers, such as were imparted by the Constitution which created it; or shall anarchy and final and irretrievable ruin be the portion of this people? This, my friends, is the "rugged issue" set before us.

This great question may or may not be settled by the ballot-box, this fall, in the several States where elections are to be held. If it shall fail to be settled by that great tribunal of public opinion, acting as a moral and admonitory power upon those who now control the affairs of the nation, then we know by many a modern instance of usurpation and outrage, by what *means* the question is to be put to rest forever. Whatever may be the result, the question itself is directly involved. The radical portion of the Republican party have put the question squarely at issue before the people. They say, as plainly as human action can say it, that there shall be no Union of these States unless the negro shall be recognized as part and parcel of that Union, and as a full and equal participant in all its great privileges and immunities. Notwithstanding they solemnly passed resolutions in Congress, during the war, declaring to the American people and to the world that it was *not* a war for conquest and subjugation, but that so soon as the rebel forces should lay down their arms and acknowledge the federal authority the States

rebellion should be restored to all their rights and dignity within the Union; yet when the Southern people have laid down their arms more than two years ago, and fully recognized and submitted to the authority of the General Government upon every inch of their soil, abolished slavery forever as an atoning sacrifice to peace and reuion, this same Republican Congress now refuse them every right belonging to them as States, reducing them to the *abject* condition of conquered provinces. For all questions of right and privilege under the Constitution, they unflinchingly declare them to be *out of the Union*, while for all purposes of obligation and duty, either as States or as individuals, they are sternly and rigidly held, by the strong arm of military power, as members of the Union. They deny them representation, while they load them down to the last dollar with taxation. This despotic dogma of taxation without representation is a terrible political libel upon the spirit and action of our revolutionary fathers in the very formation of this Government under which we live. It was the great question which lay at the foundation of our revolutionary struggle with Great Britain. The war-cry which rang like a trumpet through the colonies was, eternal resistance to taxation without representation. It gave dignity and power to the thousand petitions sent to the throne of the British tyrant; it gave eloquence to the tongue of an Adams, an Otis and a Henry in the colonial assemblies, and to a Pitt, a Burke and a Barre in the Parliament of England in the great legislative discussion which preceded the war; it served the arm of the soldier upon the battle-field when discussion gave way to the clash of arms; and it thrilled the great heart of the people throughout the land into the most heroic determination to achieve freedom and independence. It is wonderful how history reproduces itself. In passing, only a few days ago, along the old battle-fields of Trenton, and Princeton, and Monmouth, on the plains of New Jersey, my mind was sadly and deeply impressed with the strange reflection that the great Democratic party of the nation was now doubtfully contending for the very same rights, and asserting the very same principles, that Washington and Mercer fought for on those bloody fields of the Revolution. Is it not so, my friends?

Is it not a burning shame, a deep and lasting reproach upon our character as a free people, and our intelligence and patriotism as citizens, that we are now, through the machinations of a desperate party to retain power, sanctioning the very doctrines which compelled the Declaration of Independence? There is not a more complete parallel in history than this; for what does that Declaration assert of oppression and wrong, of usurpation and outrage, as against English tyranny, that might not be declared with equal force against Radical Republicanism in these modern days?

The Declaration alleges that the English King endeavored "to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power." Ten States of this Union, groaning under the iron heel of five military despots, present the mournful counterpart.

The declaration charges that he quartered "large bodies of armed troops among us." The same thing now exists all over the South.

The Declaration charges him with "imposing taxes on us without our consent." Ten millions of American people, seven millions more than existed at the time of the Revolution, are taxed without representation.

The Declaration charges that "he has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance." I need not cite the parallel—there is not an hour in the day that we do not *feel* its presence.

The Declaration charges that "he has kept, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our Legislature." A standing army, largely made up of negro troops, is now spread over half of our territory, at an annual expense of \$250,000,000.

The Declaration charges that we are "deprived, in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury." The trial by jury, in all cases, is utterly abolished in all the Southern States.

The Declaration charges him with "taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering, fundamentally, the powers of our government." All this is equally true of the present tyranny. The great Radical Autocrat asserted on the floor of the House

of Representatives only a few weeks ago that all that remained of the Constitution was a few fragments sticking in the kidneys of timid and over virtuous Senators.

The Declaration charges that he protected his emissaries "from punishment, by a mock trial, for murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States." That infamous bill, called the Indemnity act, of March 3, 1863, does the same thing.

The Declaration charges the English Parliament with "suspending our own legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever." That omnibus of all abominations, called the Supplementary Reconstruction bill, passed last month by a Rump Congress, erects the same unmitigated despotism over an extent of country nearly as large as that of all Europe, and subjects the lives and property of an entire people to the rule of the bayonet and the will of the negro.

There stands, my fellow-citizens, upon one of the streets in the northern part of Boston a quaint old building, world-renowned, called Faneuil Hall. It is sometimes named as the "Cradle of American Liberty;" how sad the reflection that it may hereafter be pointed out as its "Grave." Within its walls was heard the first articulate voice of civil liberty on this continent—the embryo life of the Constitution was inaugurated there—how strange the contradiction that its "Great Defender," in after years, should be refused to speak within its portals in defense of that same Constitution. But such are the results of fanaticism! Is it not strange, my fellow citizens, ay, is it not "passing strange," that from this Rutli of American independence, this temple once dedicated to the great principles of Constitutional law and civil liberty, should be fulminated those tyrannic decrees of party despotism which have stricken down all law in the land, and made the Constitution the merest mockery and a current by-word among the people; and that upon the walls of that once honored edifice the names of a Wilson, a Sumner, and a Boutwell are impiously placed high above those of an Adams, an Otis and a Hancock? And yet it is most true—

"Can such things be, and overcome us like a summer cloud,
Without our special wonder?"

Let us reverently, my fellow-citizens, turn for a moment to one of those days in the olden time, when the people assembled in solemn town meeting to discuss the great question of representative liberty. I do this, not with the vain purpose of rounding a period, or to play the orator, but with the design of impressing upon your minds the nature, the necessity, and the vital importance of this great question of the right of representation in a constitutional government like ours. We can not drink too often or too deeply at these fountains of liberty and law. A recurrence to first principles is essential to the preservation of public liberty. In the forcible figure of a great man on a great occasion, and in the inception of the very troubles which are now upon us:

"When the mariner has been tossed, for many days, in thick weather, and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude, and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence, and, before we float farther on the waves, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are."

This figure of rhetoric is as applicable to nations as it is to individuals. The American people have drifted far from their original moorings. The party now in power, and who shape the policy and control the affairs of the Government, occupy the same position in relation to the rights and liberties of ten millions of their fellow-countrymen, which George III did towards the three millions of colonists prior to the revolution. The historic parallel is pointed and significant, and can neither be denied or defended. Let us turn to a scene in that old Faneuil Hall one hundred years ago. In doing so, I produce you no "Copperhead" document, no newspaper scrap, but I read to you from the 11th Vol. of "Dodsley's Annual Register," page 237, printed in Pall Mall, London, in 1768, the year that these proceedings took place:

[From the New York Gazette, Sept. 26, 1768.]

"PROCEEDINGS AT BOSTON.

"BOSTON, Sept. 19, 1768.

"At a meeting of the freeholders, and other inhabitants of the town of Boston, legally qualified and warned in public town meeting assembled, at Faneuil Hall, on Monday, the 12th of September, A. D. 1768."

"The meeting was opened with prayer by the Rev. Dr. Cooper.

"The Hon. James Otis, Esq., was unanimously chosen mediator.

"The petition of a considerable number of the respectable inhabitants to the selectmen, dated the 8th inst., praying that the town might be forthwith legally convened to enquire of his excellency, the Governor, the grounds and reasons of sundry declarations made by him, that *three regiments may be daily expected, two of them to be quartered in this town, and one at Castle William*, as also to consider the most wise, constitutional, loyal and salutary measures to be adopted on such occasion, was read, whereupon the following vote was passed:

"WHEREAS, It has been reported in this town meeting, that his Excellency the Governor has intimated his apprehensions that one or more regiments of his Majesty's troops are daily expected to be here:

"Voted, That Hon. Thomas Cushing, Esq., Mr. Samuel Adams, Richard Dana, Esq., Benj. Kent, Esq., and Dr. Joseph Warren, be a committee to wait upon his Excellency, it in town, humbly requesting that he would be pleased to communicate to the town the grounds and assurances he may have thereof.

"The committee appointed to take the state of our public affairs into consideration, reported the following declaration and resolves:

"WHEREAS, It is the first principle of civil society, founded in nature and reason, that no law of the society can be binding on any individual *without his consent, given by himself in person, or by his representative, of his own free election.*

"Voted, As the opinion of this town, that the levying money in this province for the use and service of the Crown, in other manner than the same is granted by the great and general court of this province, is in violation of the undoubted natural rights of subjects, declared in the aforesaid act of Parliament, freely to give and grant their own money for the service of the Crown, with their own consent, *in person, or by representatives of their own free election.*

"And whereas, in the aforesaid act of Parliament it is declared, that the raising or keeping a standing army within the Kingdom, in time of peace, is against law; it is the opinion of this town, that the said declarations are founded in the indefeasible right of the subjects to be consulted, and to give their free consent, *in person, or by representatives of their own free election,* to the raising and keeping a standing army among them; and the inhabitants of this town, being free subjects, have the same right, derived from nature, and confirmed by the British Constitution; and, therefore, the raising or keeping an army, *without their consent, in person, or by representatives of their own free election,* would be an infringement of their natural, constitutional and chartered rights; and the employing such acts for the enforcing of law made without the consent of the people, in person, or by their representatives, would be a grievance.

"The foregoing report being divers times distinctly read, and considered by the town, the question was put, whether the same shall be accepted and recorded? and passed unanimously in the affirmative."

Fellow citizens, the proceedings of that little town meeting, thus spread upon the pages of a British journal, constituted the first corner stone of the revolution; a revolution which Samuel Adams, one of the members of that committee, afterwards done more to forward and bring to a happy issue than any other civilian in America; a revolution which Dr. Joseph Warren, another member, eight years afterwards sealed with his blood upon the glorious field of Bunker Hill. And what was the spirit of that old Boston town meeting? What great principles did it declare? I tell you,

my friends, it was the spirit of your Constitution; it was the spirit which now animates the great Democratic party of the Union in their struggles to save and preserve that Constitution. He is either a bigot or a fool who does not see the exact identity of position occupied by the Boston colonists of 1768 and the Democrats of 1867. But let us turn to another scene of those olden times; upon a body of men as illustrious as any in history; a body of men whose every name is a synonym for noble self-devotion to liberty and law.—Let us turn to the First Colonial Congress in 1774. What do they declare, on that occasion, as tyranny is closing tighter and tighter around them? In a petition to the throne, they describe the precise condition of the ten States of the South, under their present military subjugation, in setting forth the wrongs of the thirteen colonies in 1774. Listen:

"A standing army has been kept in these Colonies ever since the conclusion of the late war, without the consent of our assemblies; and this army, with a considerable naval armament, has been employed to enforce the collection of taxes. *The authority of the commander-in-chief, AND UNDER HIM THE BRIGADIERS GENERAL, has in time of peace been rendered supreme in all the civil governments of America. The commander-in-chief of all your Majesty's forces in North America has in time of peace been appointed governor of a Colony.*"—11 vol. *Dodley's Annual Register*, 23.

Who signed this early protocol of freedom? Turn to your Declaration of Independence and you will see the glorious catalogue—Adams, Dickinson, Mifflin, Sherman, Livingston, Henry, Harrison, Lee, Rutledge, Reid, Sullivan, Washington. The miserable old "Copperheads!" they did not seem to know they were promulgating treason and sympathy with rebels, in the opinion of some of their wiser and more patriotic descendants! But let us once more lift the veil of time, and again look in upon this same body of miserable revolutionary "traitors," sitting in solemn session in Philadelphia, two months before the petition just noticed, to-wit, on the 5th day of September, 1774. Instead of addressing the deaf ears of the throne, they now appeal to the people of England in behalf of their rights and liberty. In that document they say:

"Why, then, are the proprietors of the soil of America less lords of their property than you are of yours, or why should they submit to the disposal of your Parliament, or any other Parliament, or Council, in the world, *out of their election?* Can the intervention of the sea that divides us cause disparity in rights, or

"any reason be given, why English subjects, who live three thousand miles from the royal palace, should enjoy less liberty than those who are three hundred miles distant from it! * * * Now mark the ministerial plan for enslaving us. Well aware that such hardly attempts (to take our property from us—to deprive us of that valuable right of trial by jury—to seize our persons, and carry us for trial to Great Britain—to blockade our ports—to destroy our charters, and change our form of government) would occasion, and had already occasioned great discontent in all the colonies, which might produce opposition to these measures, an act was passed "to protect, indemnify, and screen from punishment, such as might be guilty even of murder, in endeavoring to carry their oppressive edicts into execution."—*Doddsley's Annual Register*, vol. 17, pages 203 and 212.

Were Lincoln and his party plagiarists in despotism? Did they search the English Parliamentary Rolls for precedents in wrong and outrage? Who does not see, in this quotation from the British act against the colonists, the exact prototype of the infamous American Indemnity Act of March 3, 1863? The truth is, the whole proceedings of the Republican party in this country, for the last six years, during the war and since, are nothing but a bald rehearsal of English outrages, a mere transcript of the most tyrannic laws against the rights and liberties of our Revolutionary forefathers.

Here, then, my fellow-citizens, is the great and cardinal doctrine which underlies the whole structure of our Government. The principle that a people shall not be taxed without their consent, or without representation, and that the military must be subordinate to the civil power, is recognized wherever liberty exists, as the great fundamental *idea* of Constitutional Government. It is proudly announced to the world in our Declaration of Independence. It is solemnly declared in the Constitution of the United States, which every member of Congress who now denies it to the Southern people, has sworn to support and maintain, with uplifted hand, before God and man. No crowned king upon the throne of England for the last two hundred years, no English Parliament, with the single exception of the American Stamp Act, has dared to impose a tax upon the people against their consent, or without representation in the body imposing the tax. There are two old shires or counties in England, Durham and Chester, which never have been taxed, not even did Charles I. dare to levy his ship money upon them, for the reason that they never were represented in the House of Commons. Shall liberty be better protected in England than in this

Union of ours? The halls of St. Stephen echoed back the sentiments of Faneuil Hall. The great Earl of Chatham, while he claimed absolute dominion by the crown over the colonies upon every other question, startled the tyrant upon his throne in his bold and eloquent denunciation of the doctrine of taxation without representation. In his speech, in the House of Commons, on the 20th day of January, 1775, he said:

"This resistance to your arbitrary system of taxation might have been foreseen; it was obvious from the nature of things and of mankind; and above all, from the whiggish spirit flourishing in that country. The spirit which now resists your taxation in America is the same which formerly opposed loans, benevolences and ship money in England; the same spirit which called England on its legs, and by the bill of rights vindicated the English Constitution: the same spirit which established the great fundamental, essential maxim of your liberties, *that no subject of England shall be taxed but by his own consent.*"

On another occasion he said:

"The Americans have not acted in all things with prudence and temper; they have been wronged; they have been driven to madness by injustice. Will you punish them for the madness you have occasioned? Rather let prudence and temper come first from this side—I will undertake for America she will follow the example.

"Upon the whole, I will beg leave to tell the house what is my opinion. It is, that the stamp act be repealed, absolutely, totally, unconditionally and immediately. That the reason for the repeal be assigned, *because it was founded on an erroneous principle—taxation without representation.*"

Oh! my fellow-citizens, how humiliating, how melancholy, how startling is the fact, that an American Congress, sitting under a written Constitution which clearly forbids such monstrous usurpation of power, should be willing to deprive ten millions of American freemen of representative Government, and yet tyrannically impose upon them all the burdens and all the obligations of that Government. I say here before this audience of free-born citizens that the proposition is *monstrous*—that it is the very *essence* of tyranny and oppression—and that no Government on earth, not an absolute monarchy, can long exist in the exercise of such gross usurpation of power. The so-called Republican party, having changed front upon this question, occupy their present position upon two assumed grounds of justification: First, that the States lately in rebellion *are out of the Union*; and second, that it is a just *punishment* for their rebellion. Both of these propositions are wholly untenable. The Southern States, *as States*, are *not* out of the Union; and Congress is wholly without power, legally or constitu-

tionally, to inflict any punishment whatever. That great power of executing the law, and punishment can only be inflicted by virtue of some existing law, belongs exclusively to another and a co-ordinate branch of the Government. Any attempt by Congress to exercise this great judicial power is gross usurpation, and is subversive of the great principles of the Government.

It is difficult, fellow-citizens, to keep pace with this Republican party in its sudden change of position as to where, by the Constitution, the great power of this Government is deposited. But two short years ago, it was not the Legislative, but the Executive Department, which was supreme over all the rest. Indeed, at that time, to question or criticise the acts of the President, was denounced as disloyalty to the Government; to be incredulous as to the wisdom or propriety of Abraham Lincoln, was absolute and unmitigated treason, and the inconsiderate culprit was fortunate, indeed, if he did not find himself incarcerated in some military fortress, or tried and shot by some drum-head court-martial. Men were arrested and banished the country not for anything which they had *done*, but for some possible thing which they *might* do. Although the great mass of the Republican leaders had shouted themselves hoarse, in the canvass under Fremont, for "free press" and "free speech," yet when Abraham Lincoln ordered the suppression of more than one hundred Democratic newspapers, and imprisoned thousands of men for words spoken in debate, they sent up loud hosannas, and made the welkin ring with their plaudits for the outrage. But, presto! change! The Presidential office has now lost all its virtue, and they have, indeed, shorn it of all its power. The National Executive, in view of its late usurped powers under Lincoln, like some huge Leviathan,

"Prone on the flood extended long and large,
Lay floating many a rood."

But it floats there now as a dead carcass, swollen by past usurpation, with all its constitutional life crushed out, alike powerless for good or evil. All the great powers of the Government, legislative, executive and judicial, in defiance of the Constitution, and in despite of the solemn admonitions of the Father of his Country, have been absorbed by a mere fragment of the Congress of the United States. We

are now living under as naked a Despotism, by usurpation, as ever cursed or persecuted a people, ancient or modern. This powerful and unscrupulous organization not only change their attack upon the several departments of the Government as may best suit their purposes, but their proclivities, for change in other respects are equally facile and convenient. Upon the great and vital question of the unity of Constitutional Government over all the States, and of the unbroken reciprocal relation of all the States themselves to the Government, they have changed from one extreme to the other. Dare any Republican deny this proposition to be true? The public records of the country, legislative, executive and judicial, bear overwhelming evidence of the fact. During the whole progress of the war, whether in victory or defeat, to suit their purposes, they claimed that the Southern States were never out of the Union; while now, for mere party purposes and selfish aims, they unblushingly assert they are but the victims of the sword as conquered territory; and whether they shall ever again be admitted into the Union as States, depends entirely upon the arbitrary will of a vindictive and partisan Congress. I shall not multiply the proof upon this proposition. I shall give you but two instances, though scores of them might be produced. In April, 1862, in the debate in the Senate of the United States, on the resolutions of Mr. Sumner in aid of emancipation, Senator Sherman, of this State, one of the acknowledged leaders of the party, said:

"I, therefore, cannot help but say that while I respect the motives of the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, while I give him credit for consistency, ability, and a great deal of culture, and am always glad to hear him speak, yet I must confess that when I looked over his resolutions, they struck me with surprise and regret. They would revolutionize this Government. *Sir, strike the States out of this system of government, and your Government is lost and gone.—I cannot conceive of the United States governing colonies and provinces containing millions upon millions of people, black and white. I do not think such a thing can exist. I do not believe it is in the power of secession to bring us to such a state of things. I can draw no distinction between the resolutions of the Senator from Massachusetts and the doctrines that are proclaimed by Jefferson Davis.* * * * The doctrine of the Senator is substantially an acknowledgment of the right of secession, of the right to secede. He, however, puts the States in the condition of *object Territories*, to be governed by Congress. Jefferson Davis puts it in the power of the people of the States to govern the States themselves. *As to which is the most dangerous or obnoxious doctrine, I leave every man to determine.*"—Congressional Globe, 37th Congress, p. 1493.

Bravely said, Mr. Senator Sherman! and yet afterwards, in July, 1867, when peace

reigned profound throughout the land, you either cowardly or dishonestly voted for one of the most infamous bills which ever disgraced the legislation of a free people, and which *struck down every State in the South*; abolished every civil institution, courts, juries, magistrates, legislatures, political and municipal rights; every privilege known to civilization; and erected in their stead a huge military despotism, placing the lives, the liberties and the property of the entire white people of the South, without remedy or appeal, at the mercy of a military pro-consul. What a pink of consistency is this brave Ohio Senator! and yet he is only a type of his class, a sample of the party to which he belongs.

Let us, now, for a brief moment, turn to a still greater light of Republicanism, Thad. Stevens. On the 9th day of last month, Mr. Stevens introduced into the House of Representatives this monstrous bill of abominations. On that occasion, he spoke as follows:

"It ought to be known before this time by the President of the United States—it is known, I trust, by the scholars in every colored school in this district—that the Constitution of the United States does not apply to any territory. The States are parties to the Constitution; they are the contracting powers; they are the substantive body. Territory, however, acquired by purchase or conquest, or by inheritance, is the property only of that substantive power, of that power bound by the Constitution, and that power alone is governed by the Constitution, but does not extend for any purpose into any territory or conquered province. Why, then, talk about the Constitution regulating the action of Congress in a province, in a territory, in a conquered State, whether conquered from a legitimate State or an illegitimate State? I may be asked how we would treat the Confederate States of America? *Just as Congress chooses.* THEY ARE OUR PROPERTY; *their citizens are our subjects.* THEIR LIVES, THEIR LIBERTIES, ARE SUBJECT TO THE SUPREME WILL OF THIS BODY."—*Congressional Globe*, 40th Congress, p. 545.

Here, then, my fellow-citizens, we have the two phases of Republicanism upon this great and all-absorbing question of the Union of these States; the one held during the war, and the other adopted since. The idea of Stevens, carried into this bill, for the indiscriminate punishment of ten millions of people, is one of the most nefarious schemes of cruelty and wrong, and of usurped power, that was ever suggested by political vengeance.—He boldly asserts that Congress holds in the hollow of its hand the life of every white man in the South! Did Nero, or Caligula, or Robespierre claim more? And this is the kind of Government, is it, which Washington, and Franklin, and Jefferson, and Madison put in operation

in 1787? No, no, my friends, not that—not that.

Now, fellow citizens, if it is true that there is no constitutional right for any one or more States to secede from the Federal Union, as contradistinguished from the common right of revolution for good cause existing, which is a natural right inherent in the people of all governments; then all the ordinances of secession were mere paper nullities, and wholly and utterly void; and the Southern people, having failed to withdraw their States and form and maintain a new government, *by force of arms*, it follows as a logical conclusion, that the States in rebellion never were practically out of the Union. The question may be stated in this wise: the Union is either dissolved or it is not dissolved. These Southern States, in their political character of States, are either *in* or they are *out* of that Union, as a constitutional fact. They cannot occupy both positions at one and the same time, any more than a material body can occupy two portions of space at one and the same time. This is the inevitable logic of the problem, if we admit, as we must admit, that there are but two modes, outside of mutual consent, by which they can get out at all, to wit: by secession, if they have the constitutional right to secede; or *by force of arms*, in a revolution prosecuted to a successful termination, whether they have such right or not. If this position is correct, and it was, in effect, the clear and distinct position of President Lincoln and his Cabinet in the conduct of the war, by what authority, or by what show of reason or constitutional power, can Congress deny to these ten Southern States representation in the councils of the government? Their power of rejection, so far as they have any such power, is clearly and explicitly defined in the Constitution itself. It is only by virtue of that instrument that Congress itself exists. That power applies solely to *members* and not to *States*. It touches only the personal qualifications of *individuals*, and not the political qualification of *States* in their capacity of confederated sovereignties. The law of a common commercial partnership between individuals, although there is no comparison between the two cases in dignity and importance, will aptly enough illustrate the question. Any one or more members

of a common partnership cannot arbitrarily expel a fellow member from the firm, although in law and in fact he may have forfeited all right to membership. They have no such power. The law can ordain a dissolution, but not a *portion* only of the partners. So in this great Union or political partnership of States; Massachusetts, as a State or a member of the partnership, has no constitutional power to decide whether or not South Carolina, as a State, is a rightful member of such Union. Any such theory as that would produce confusion, and conflict, and anarchy in our whole confederated system. Our fathers wisely provided for even so remote a contingency. Upon all such questions, they set over all the States and all the departments of the General Government, a grand national judicial tribunal, whose decrees were to be the supreme law of the land, and whose determinations, when deliberately made, are declared to be final and irreversible. If the present Radical Congress have the right and the Constitutional power to say that South Carolina shall not be represented in the councils of the nation as they have even gone so far as to say Kentucky shall not be, then they have precisely the same right and power to say that the sovereign State of Ohio shall not be represented, whether in or out of rebellion. If she shall go Democratic this fall, I shall not be at all surprised if the proposition is made to expel her, upon the ground of her *disloyalty*. The whole thing will depend upon Massachusetts. Congress assumes to act, not upon the personal qualifications of the individual member, as to his age or citizenship, or whether he has been legally returned by a majority of the qualified electors of his district; but upon the question whether the State, *as such*, in her character of a sister sovereign *shall be represented at all*. There could, in my humble opinion, be no clearer violation of the Constitution than this. It would be erecting a tribunal within the Constitution, by its mere creature, higher than the Constitution itself; for it nowhere appears in that instrument, by the slightest implication of its terms, that a State, *as such*, can forfeit her right as a member of the Union. The idea that a majority of the States shall have the power to expel or annihilate another or a minority of the States, is a rank and

naked political heresy, and is too absurd to merit argument.

But, my fellow-citizens, outside of these constitutional questions, and simply as a question of policy and humanity, what is the *great duty of the hour*, set before the American people? Is it mercy or is it vengeance? Answer me, not as Turks or Hottentots, not as wild savages or rude barbarians, but as men, as intelligent citizens, as Evangelized Christians in the nineteenth century of the Prince of Peace. For one, standing here as a man and as an American citizen, yielding to none in devotion to the best interests of my country, I have no hesitation in saying that this duty will be best performed by admitting these Southern people at once and unconditionally, except the imposition of the Constitutional oath of allegiance, into this great family of independent commonwealths. But, say our political opponents, and I give them the benefit of their position, these men are secessionists and traitors, and should be *punished* as such by *excluding* them from all the privileges and benefits of the Government which they sought to overthrow. The plain and simple answer to this objection is, that if they are traitors in a technical and legal sense, after we acknowledged them as a belligerent power under the law of nations, their treason and its consequences are clearly defined in a written Constitution, and the laws of the country amply furnish the means and the manner of their punishment. But I repeat, that punishment can only be meted out to individuals, and not to States.

The whole policy of the Republican party in relation to the question of reconciliation and reunion of the two great sections lately in armed conflict, is not only unwise and impolitic, but it is wholly unsuited and repugnant to a people accustomed to liberty and law. It is a most fatal mistake to suppose that we can cure the evils of civil war by furnishing new and more aggravated grounds for rebellion. Such a policy may suit an arbitrary and despotic government in form, not based upon popular opinion, and not deriving its authority from the popular will, for the reason that *force* is the very essence of its existence; but you never can attach a proud and free people to such a government, except by just and equal laws. If the immense mass of legislation, by Con-

gress, in relation to the late rebellion, falsely denominated acts of reconstruction, was intended as a *punishment* to a whole people, dragged into revolution by a few restless and desperate parties on both sides of the unhappy controversy, in God's name has not that punishment, in addition to the ruin and devastation of the war itself, been ample and comprehensive enough? Is there to be no limit to our vengeance? Is there to be no change in a policy which can end only in universal anarchy and ruin? Is it not monstrous to fasten upon the entire white population of the South a fate and a degradation unknown in all history—that of subjecting, by force, an educated and civilized people to be the mere political vassals, the hewers of wood and drawers of water to an ignorant and barbarous people, who, prior to the war, were themselves the slaves of the conquered? In the profoundest depths of social and political degradation, there is no “lower deep” than that. Such a thing has no precedent in history. Rome, in her worst days of rapacity and conquest, never was guilty of such refined cruelty, such unnatural wrong. She conquered the rude nations around her, not to degrade and destroy by her power, but to refine and elevate by her laws. She carried her laws and her civilization along with her conquering legions, and gave to her rude and conquered enemies at least all the rights of a colonial Roman citizenship. No, my fellow-citizens, mercy, and not vengeance, is the great duty of the hour. When we take into full and candid consideration the complex and delicately balanced powers, the great diversity of interests, and the antagonism of opinion which has existed, and which *must* exist in such a government as ours, and when we recollect that the great and sanguinary conflicts which took place on the fields of Gettysburg, of Antietam, or of Chancellorsville, were but intensified forms of the battles which for a quarter of a century before had been fought between Webster and Hayne, and Clay and Calhoun, upon the same questions and for the same end, caused by an honest but wide difference of opinion as to what our Government is or was intended to be; when we look at these things as philosophers and not as partisans, as Christians and not as fiends, charity, forbearance, *forgiveness* should mark the

conduct of both rulers and people. It is through this spirit *only* that our Government can last. If hatred and vengeance and oppression shall be permitted to take and hold its place, then indeed are the days of the Union numbered, and the liberty which springs from it, and is secured by it, will be extinguished forever.

We are now, fellow-citizens, reaping the bitter fruits of a departure from the early course of the Government, the dire consequences of neglecting the wise admonitions of Washington in relation to sectional feelings and geographical prejudices. We have passed through the fiery furnace of a war, heated by the bad passions of both parties; let us now wisely endeavor to restore peace and harmony with the bitter knowledge war has given us of each other's power for destruction, as well as a better understanding of each other's wants and character. The war itself was a reproach upon free institutions; do not let our conduct since its termination be also a reproach upon justice and humanity. Let us not, at least, be inferior to the heathen nations of antiquity in all that dignifies man and elevates him above the unreasoning fierceness of the brute creation. I never could think, during the progress of the war, without an emotion almost amounting to tears, of that sublime and touching passage in Roman history, when one of their civil wars was brought to a sudden and happy end by the fraternal feeling and magnanimity of the common soldiery. Livy relates that during the consulship of Marcus Valerius Corvus there was a law of Rome that a debtor and his whole family might be sold as slaves for the benefit of the creditor. This hard and cruel law, passed by the Patrician Senate in its days of arbitrary power, had created discontent among the commons of Rome and in the outlying provinces, and particularly in the army of Campania. A large section of the commons *seceded from the Government of Rome*, and, uniting with the army of Campania, raised the standard of revolt. The forces of the city, under the command of Valerius, marched out to give battle to the insurgents, who were posted in strong force outside the city, under Titus Quinctius. The historian further states that as soon as the army sent to oppose them came in sight, and they distinguished the arms and the well-known standards of

their country, their regard for each other instantly softened every hostile breast in that mighty host. The two armies stood gazing at each other in mute silence; the electric sympathy of race, of common brotherhood, and of a common love of country, overcame their hostile feelings and intentions; they threw down their weapons, rushed into each other's arms, and peace and harmony was restored amid the tears and sobs and rejoicings of the whole glad people of Rome. That was a scene of moral grandeur and heroic self-conquest which the mythical gods of Rome themselves might have looked down upon with admiration. What a contrast does that memorable scene, enacted in *heathen* Rome more than two thousand years ago, present to the miserable drama of hatred and wrong enacted in the Capitol at Washington by the representatives of the American people! Another scene, from a less veritable page of Roman history, starts up to our view. We learn from one of the old legends of that people, that a deep and wide-opening gulf suddenly appeared in the Forum of the seven-hill'd city; and that the oracle declared it would never close until Rome threw into it her most precious and priceless jewels. Marcus Curtius, with the declaration that love of country was the richest jewel of a nation, leaped into the jaws of the greedy chasm, and its dark walls closed upon him forever. In a typical sense, we too have a yawning gulf in our midst, running from Chesapeake Bay to the sea of Mexico; but *our* oracle, seated in the breast of many an anxious patriot, indicates quite a different sacrifice from that of the Roman. It announces to us, in tones of solemn warning, that this deep and separating abyss *never* will close until all which is now rankling in the American mind, hatred, bigotry, oppression and wrong, are thrown into it, as a common sacrifice to peace and reunion.

Thus, fellow-citizens, I have presented to you what I conceive to be the high moral solution of the difficulties by which we are surrounded, and the *great duty of the hour* which devolves upon every true patriot and lover of his country well and wisely to perform. A great national calamity has been brought upon us by the common errors and the common wrongs of both parties to the contest, the Republicans of the North and the Secessionists of the South. Amnesty and Union are the

only remedies for the mighty evils that are upon us. The question of Union stands high above even that of finance, or trade, or commerce, for the reason that it embraces, and it only can ultimately sustain, all these great public interests. It is the great circle which includes all the lesser ones. That Union can only be restored or maintained by the spirit which made it. Some portion of that spirit of compromise and concession which animated our fathers in overcoming almost the same difficulties in founding the Republic, is more essential now in avoiding the dangers which threaten to overthrow and destroy it. If we are wise, if we are honest, if we are willing to be guided by the solemn admonitions of history, we will lose none of the precious time which is slipping from us in binding these States once more together by an equal and common interest in all the great rights and privileges of a common Constitution.

There is another view to be taken of the situation, which, though not involving so high a question of moral duty, is yet of vast importance to the great interests of the country, and cannot well be omitted in the consideration of the emergencies of the terrible crisis in which the nation is involved, and that is the question of finance and taxation. You will permit me to make but a single point upon it. The public debt of the country is admitted, I believe on all hands, to be about the sum of \$3,000,000,000 in the bonds of the Government and otherwise. Three Thousand Millions of Dollars! Those few words slip very easily off the tongue. They do not strike the mind, ordinarily, with that stunning and overwhelming force which belongs to the *real* magnitude of the sum. The minds of the people have been made so familiar with great and almost fabulous sums of money during the war—the stealings of shoddy contractors, camp followers, and official agents of the Republican party generally—that the idea of millions, like the first few drops of the tippler, has lost all its power of stimulation. The student of history, however will appreciate the vast proportions of this public debt, when he reflects that it is about equal to that extraordinary and huge system of public finance known as the national debt of England, which has been accumulating for two hundred years, and represents the expenses of all her great wars from the

time of Marlborough to that of Wellington; with this great difference as a burden upon the respective countries, that England's resources more than double ours, and that she pays at the rate of less than one-half the interest that we do—Three thousand millions of dollars!—it requires reflection, calculation, comparison, to realize the full extent of its vast accumulation. It is so far beyond all ordinary or possible range of individual, or even associated private business, that the mind fails to comprehend it as an abstraction. Standing in the department of public affairs, it can only be measured by some kindred subject, which either controls or is controlled by it. Let us, then, look at it for a moment in relation to the primary thing which it represents, or rather that which it rests upon and binds, and will in the end control, as a security for its repayment, and we can then form some adequate conception of its vast and startling significance. The official public statistics of the country for 1860, the year preceding the war, and certainly when the country was at its highest pitch of wealth and prosperity, show that the aggregate value of the entire real estate, lands and town lots and buildings, in the whole United States, North and South, was the sum of \$6,925,195,353, or within a fraction of seven thousand millions of dollars. It therefore appears, according to the last census report, that our national debt, to say nothing of the debts of the several States, and all other forms of valid public liability, equal, perhaps, to a thousand millions of dollars more, amounts nearly to one-half of the value of the real property in the whole United States! Excluding Kentucky, Maryland and Delaware from the Southern situation, (although if we look at the pointed legislation of the July Congress, just closed, we may well put these three States in the category of the seceding States, for a committee is even now in session to put them under the ban of a like despotism,) the Southern States represented, in 1860, about the sum of \$2,000,000,000 of this valuation, or nearly one-third of the whole value of all the real estate of the Union. In the present inflated condition of the circulating medium of the country, real estate in the North has undoubtedly advanced in price, though not in real value, since 1860. But if both money and property were reduced

to their real intrinsic value, or what is the same thing, if the currency was reduced, either by law or a commercial crisis, to its real value measured by the gold standard, it would drag down with it the value of property also; so that we should find as one of the results of the war, and in connection with the financial bearings of debt and taxation, that the real estate of the country had in fact actually decreased in value since 1860.

Now, this immense public debt, although it is not now in process of payment as to its capital, is already pressing down the people, even in the present plethoric condition of the currency, with a weight of taxation unknown anywhere else on the face of the earth, to raise the means to pay its accruing interest. No public debt of the world has commanded the exorbitant rate of interest we are now paying on ours. That interest, in round numbers, amounts to nearly the sum of \$200,000,000 per annum; an amount which would have carried on the government, in all its expenses, ordinary and extraordinary, for fifteen years, under the administrations of John Quincy Adams and Gen. Jackson. The amount of revenue raised by taxes, either direct or indirect, to pay this semi-annual interest, and for the other wants of the government, amounted, during the fiscal year just ended, to the enormous sum of \$558,000,000. It is perfect madness to suppose that any government on earth, whether free or despotic, of equal resources, can long stand such an annual drain upon its powers. The people must have retrenchment and reform, radical and immediate, or misery and ruin must be their portion. At this rate of reducing the property of the country to revenue, for it will approximate that process whenever the crisis shall come, it would require a period of less than ten years to absorb the entire real estate of the North. Will the American people ever wake up to a just appreciation of these startling facts? If they do, and can divest themselves of the maddening influences of party hatred and vengeance, (for the war itself was a naked political question,) will not the fact that to restore these Southern States to the fostering influences of the Union and consequently to the prosperity which belongs to renewed life and vigor in all the channels of industry,

trade and commerce, from which, in other days, so much of the public revenues of the government were obtained, be the surest means of relief from a burden now almost too grievous to bear, at once suggest the remedy, for the evils of this most unnatural separation? The problem is certainly a very plain and simple one. The amount of brain sufficient to make a demagogue can fully comprehend it. But charlatans instead of statesmen now rule the great affairs of the people, and the people themselves must suffer the consequences until they shall hurl them from power. A full conception of all that the people of the South are suffering, and all that we are losing, from the present condition of things, ought to impel every thinking honest man in the country to crash out, by his vote and influence, the miserable and destructive policy of these Radical Republicans. So long as that policy shall be pursued towards the Southern people, they will be, as they now are, a charge upon the public coffers of the nation instead of contributors. Its effect, upon the single article of cotton, to say nothing of the other great staple products of rice, sugar and tobacco, is almost incredulous. The statistics of 1860 further show that the product of that year was as follows: Alabama, 997,973 bales; Arkansas, 367,485; Florida, 63,322; Georgia, 761,846; Louisiana, 722,218; South Carolina, 353,413; Mississippi, 1,195,621; North Carolina, 145,514; Tennessee, 227,450; Texas, 405,100. Total, 5,182,205. This crop of cotton, at 20 cents per pound, which is a low estimate, would be worth the sum of \$518,220,000. The amount now produced, since the war, and even under the stimulation of Northern men as growers, is about 1,500,000 bales—a falling off of 3,682,205 bales—and also showing a deficit in value of \$378,200,000; so that in the single article of cotton we lose in actual revenue to lighten the burden of taxation, at the present rate levied upon the raw material, the enormous sum of \$54,205,750 per annum; while at the same time we are compelled to pay out of our own pockets \$35,000,000 a year to govern the Southern people by the bayonet and the negro ballot, instead of administering the Constitution and laws through the instrumentality of courts and the white man's ballot. But still more: even the tax now levied

upon raw cotton, as against the planting producer, does not necessarily go into the treasury of the United States as unqualified revenue; for if you will look into this law, made by Yankees for the benefit of Yankee cotton mill nabobs, you will find that upon certain conditions of transportation to special markets, these lords of the spindle are entitled to receive the amount of tax thus levied and paid, as a *drawback* upon the manufactured article in his hands.

This is the kind of class legislation that a Republican Congress are treating the people to. It is in this spirit that almost all our Federal laws are made. It was in this spirit that four hundred millions of dollars in the lands of the people and Government bonds postponed both for security and payment for the benefit of favored creditors, have been voted to gigantic railroad schemes, a large number of the speculators and shareholders in which you will find to have some mysterious connection, by blood or otherwise, with the law-making power at Washington. Upon all the great questions of trade and business, as between the farmers and mechanics of the West and lordly capitalists and manufacturers of the East, we are as completely the political serfs of these Yankee corporators as are the Coolies of China to their task masters. There stands this Radical majority in Congress, New England with her twelve Senators representing a population not much greater than that of Ohio with her two Senators, imperiously shaping all the legislation of the country to suit their own purposes, with no more regard for the obligations of the Constitution than if they were playing a game of base ball, or engaged in any other species of amusement. All this, and more, comes through the blessed mission of modern Radical Republicanism! But let us return, for a moment to the South, in a further development of its immense capabilities to furnish the means of national wealth, as a basis for public revenue, if by a wise course of statesmanship she were restored to the Union. The whole amount of live stock in the United States, in 1860, was a fraction over one thousand millions of dollars, of which \$452,330,331 was in the South, being nearly one-half of the entire amount in the Union. Almost the whole of that in the South was swept out of existence by the war; and the process

of replacing it will be very slow, if not impossible, in the present unsettled condition of the Southern people. They had 2,684,977 head of swine more than we had. They produced about one-third the amount of wheat that we did. They were nearly equal to us in the production of Indian corn. They produced one-fifth of the whole amount of wool in the United States; and their manufactured articles amounted to the sum of \$175,000,000. They produced 187,403,173 pounds of rice, 429,364,751 pounds of tobacco, 16,337,180 gallons of molasses, and 302,205 hog-heads of sugar; so that we might safely estimate the whole amount of revenue lost to the Government upon these articles, including cotton, at the round sum of \$100,000,000 per annum. Is this not an object worthy of the highest efforts of the political economist? Does not the character of the mere politician sink into the most utter insignificance when brought to grapple with questions like this?—and is not the good sense of a people wholly overclouded when they permit, for any longer period than they can remedy the evil at the ballot-box, such fellows to guide and control the great affairs of State? I need not say to you, my fellow-citizens, that we here in the North will feel this great loss the more or less sensibly just in the ratio that our financial affairs shall hereafter become more or less disturbed. When the crash comes, as come it will, woe either to the tax-payer or the tax-gatherer! I feel no inclination to lift the veil from what shall take place in the portentous future, and in this untried country of ours as to such scenes, when the great mass of the laboring and producing people shall be unable to pay their taxes, and their property will be seized upon by Federal tax collectors to liquidate the crushing assessments made upon them. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." We do not see the better days in the South, promised by Northern demagogues, when the war should change the system of labor in that region. We all recollect the confident and high-sounding predictions of the Republican journalists and orators as to what the negro would do, as a producer of these staple articles in his new character of freedman. The thing has proved almost an entire failure, as every Northern man will testify who went there to employ them as field hands in the cultivation of sugar and cotton. The

same results which occurred in Jamaica and Antigua, have, as a general thing, been reproduced in the South. The broad and fertile fields of that sunny land lie in dreary waste, and will so remain until a change of policy shall take place in the administration of the Government.

Is it wisdom wilfully to shut our eyes to all experience of the past? Is not the negro of Hayti and Jamaica the same as the negro of Georgia and South Carolina? The "Mountain" or Jacobin department of the French Revolutionary Assembly of 1793, the prototype in all things of the Radicals in the American Revolutionary Assembly of 1867, decreed "impartial" freedom to the blacks of Hayti. After a full and fair trial, in a country whose natural resources and fertility are unsurpassed, and with a climate eminently congenial to the black man, what has been the result? In 1790, three years before emancipation, the exports of Hayti were \$27,828,000. After an experiment of seventy years, they are now, according to a statement made by Mr. Sumner in the Senate of the United States, reduced to the sum of \$2,673,000. Emancipation in Jamaica took place in 1834. It was done at a cost to England of \$100,000,000, "distilled," in the language of the London *Times*, "from the brains and muscles of the English laborers." Prior to emancipation their exports amounted to \$15,000,000; after emancipation, to \$4,000,000. In these statistics of West Indian emancipation, we can clearly read the future of the negro among us. He will relapse into his native barbarism, indolent, improvident, brutal. His condition, at this moment, in Hayti and Jamaica, is scarcely any better than that of his race in the wildest jungles of Africa; and yet, with all this knowledge and experience, we propose to confer upon such a race the right to make laws for the white man, as well as to administer them in the character of judges and jurors. If the American people shall do this thing, or suffer it to be done by usurpation, they will deserve to reap all the dire consequences of such madness and folly.

Thus far, fellow-citizens, I have endeavored to show you that both *duty* and *interest* should impel us to an immediate Union. There is another reason not less cogent; and that is, security from external *danger*, in our relations with the other great powers of the world. It is a fact

not to be overlooked or disregarded, that the rapid and wonderful progress, heretofore, of the United States, to power and empire, has been the subject of the keenest jealousy on the part of at least one of the great maritime powers of Europe. England has not only been our former open and armed enemy, but she even now stands as one of the most alarmed and envious rivals of our trade and commerce. With all her public and official professions of amity and good feeling, she would deliver a blow to-day at our national life, if she thought she could do so with safety to her own existence. She has been the wily secret plotter of our destruction for the last quarter of a century. Her potent finger was largely in the late rebellion; the whole history of the struggle, in my opinion, shows that the Confederates had assurances of assistance in such form that, while it would avoid official obligation, it would at the same time inspire confidence and hope in the South. No other hypothesis can so well explain the madness and folly of the rebellion itself. She had, for years before the war, sent lecturers to both sides of the Union, to stir up the sectional prejudices of the people. It was only a few years ago that a prominent member of her Parliament boldly announced in the House of Commons the design to break up the American Union. No one can read the account of the perfect ovation with which Mrs. Stowe, the writer of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," was received in England, and the speeches made at Exeter Hall and Stafford House in 1853, without coming to the conclusion that a conspiracy existed among some of the leading men of that country to destroy the union of these States. Now, can any man tell me how long we may trample upon and persecute these Southern people with impunity, so far as their ultimate fidelity to the Union is concerned? Can you measure human endurance by line and rule? Is there no point in oppression and tyranny where loyalty

may end and a counter feeling begin? One might well suppose that the party in power think so. They seem to apprehend no possible danger in driving 10,000,000 of people to the wall; the ready and flippant reply always is, "we have whipped them once, and we can whip them again." All this may be so, but these brave and warlike leaders ought to know, that in God's dealings with this world of ours, some very unlooked for facts occur in the history of even the proudest and mightiest nations. A war with England, for instance, with 10,000,000 of people alienated from us on one side, 3,000,000 of British subjects on the other, and 4,000,000 of negroes to be bought up with British gold, as Hessians and Indians were once before, might be a situation not at all desirable with a bankrupt treasury, and our own people divided in opinion as to the policy which brought about the catastrophe. In such a war as that, it would be no consolation for us to know that the great battle ground would be the beautiful hills and valleys of our own State of Ohio.

And now, fellow-citizens, if the obligations of duty, of patriotism and humanity are unable to bring the Northern people to a just sense of the situation, in God's name let interest, and selfishness and *danger* work a revolution in the popular opinion. Let us have a living and equal Union; let us have it *now* before it is too late to have it at all. We cannot sustain our national life by enacting the ancient fable of tying the dead body to the living one. If we shall continue in this unnatural condition, *both will be destroyed*. The issue is now fairly before the people. The Democratic party present you both principles and candidates equal to so great a struggle. Our standard bearer, the gifted and noble Thurman, is every way worthy of the highest trust in the gift of a free people. If he shall fail to be elected, the loss will be greater to the people and to the country than to himself.